REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application. No claims are amended herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner alleges that "remote control mode" and "communications mode" are not sufficiently clear, and that there appears to be different remote control modes, that is, a mode for controlling a particular device, and a mode for programming the terminal to operate with particular devices.

Applicants note that at least FIGS. 2, 4 and 5 the related description clearly describe the "remote control mode" with reference to blocks 201, 401 and 501, respectively. Applicants note that remote control mode can include either of the two types of remote control mode functions described by the Examiner. That is, as shown in FIG. 2 for example, if a remote control setting key is detected (step 205), then the remote control mode can be "remote control setting mode" (step 207), or what the Examiner describes as programming the terminal to operate with particular devices. If the remote control setting key is not detected (step 205), and remote control mode is not terminated (step 227), then the device implements remote control functions (step 243), or what the Examiner describes as a mode for controlling a particular device.

FIG. 5 and the related description describe how a device according to the present invention operates when communication is attempted while the device is in remote control mode. As shown in FIG. 5 blocks 505-515 and described in the related

description, if incoming or outgoing communication is attempted while the device is in remote control mode, the call service is performed (blocks 509 or 513), then when the communication ends (block 515), the remote control mode can be resumed or terminated (block 517). In view of the clear figures and description, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate what is meant by the terms "remote control mode" and "communication mode," and that the term "remote control mode" can include either programming the device to control a particular device or implementing a remote control function. In view of the above explanation, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. PG Pub. No. 2005/0054337 to Nobusawa et al. Applicants note, however, the Nobusawa was filed in the U.S. on October 30, 2003, after the U.S. filing date of the present application. Accordingly, Nobusawa is not available as prior art. Applicants further note that Nobusawa claims priority to a Japanese patent applications filed on October 30, 2002 and October 1, 2003, respectively, but the Examiner has not shown that either Japanese application was published or laid open prior to the U.S. filing date of the present application. Accordingly, the rejection must be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christian C. Michel
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,300

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: July 22, 2011